

February 12, 1975

have had for fifty years. It appears to me that they are not, but I'm not sure I'm right on this.

PRESIDENT: Senator Goodrich.

SENATOR GOODRICH: Mr. President and members of the body, I would like to respond to Senator Dickinson's question. About three years ago, we did recognize chiropractors. We put them on the State Board of Health. They are working very smoothly now with the medical profession. The--if persons, for example myself, and I have done this. I have gone to a chiropractor in Omaha and, thank God, I could, because he has done for me in about three days what it would have taken a doctor in the neighborhood of three weeks to do. I would wholeheartedly support Senator Maresh's position in this and include them in this particular category because of the fact that we have included them in all of the rest of the definitions of the medical personnel throughout the rest of our statutes. I think we should be consistent and include them in this spot.

PRESIDENT: Senator Cavanaugh.

SENATOR CAVANAUGH: Mr. President and members of the Legislature, I am often identified with labor interests in this body but, in this case, I think if you adopt the amendment you will be doing--I might say that that is a wrong identification, in most cases, but I think you will be regretful for those of you who wish to support labors point of view or wish to support managements point of view because the selection of a physician, the initial selection of a physician by the injured employee, is an extremely important item as far as the impact on Workmen's Compensation altogether and the reason that chiropractors have been excluded, generally, is because they are not--they are specialists in a given field of the healing arts, as you might define it, but they are not general diagnosticians. They do not have broad abilities to diagnose a variety of illnesses or the implications of the variety of illnesses that an employee might come to them with. That absence of their training and specialty in that ability is going to effect their judgement as to what kind of injury and the implications of the injury that the employee has. That initial judgment will subsequently affect the amount of compensation that the employee will be entitled to, therefore, the amount that the carrier, or the employer, will be liable for and will have to pay, and it affects the whole economic system of the Workmen's Comp system. So I think to protect both the employer from, perhaps, faulty or excessive diagnosis or the employee from wrongful diagnosis in the initial stage, the initial selection of the diagnostician should be a physician, an individual who is trained in diagnosing all aspects of human illness and not bring into this an individual who is trained in a specific treatment of a specific physical disability. You do great injustice to the employee who might select that individual and to the employer who is going to have to pay for the results of that diagnosis. That's the fundamental reason why both employers and representatives of employees oppose the inclusion of chiropractors in this amendment because they are not general practitioners of medicine. They are not trained in the general practice and diagnosis of medicine of the entire human body. They are specialists in a given field and to allow them to be the individual first selected by the employee would, I think, create a disturbing situation in the whole Workmen's Compensation field. I oppose the amendment.